

REMARKS

The following remarks are in addition to those contained in the interview summary supplied by Examiner Vidovich dated 1 October 02. On October 1, 2002 Applicants called Examiner Blount to clarify the Election/Restriction Office Action received on September 6 2002. Examiner Blount found no issues with the office action he prepared. Applicants requested Examiner Blount to clarify what Applicants were supposed to do with the species set out as "A, A', B, B', B", D, D', D", E and E'. " Examiner Blount directed Applicants to choose one of the ten (10) groups since "they were obviously the species groups." Applicants directed Examiner Blount to MPEP section 809.02 (a) dealing with the correct way to set out species. Examiner Blount did not find this section persuasive and once again directed Applicants to choose a species from the ten (10) shown. Applicants responded that this was not acceptable due to lack of clarity. Applicants next requested the status of the eighteen (18) claims not denoted as either generic or encompassed in a species. Examiner Blount stated that these were non-generic claims. Applicants then directed Examiner Blount to MPEP section 814. Examiner Blount was unfamiliar with this section. Applicants at this point contacted Examiner Vidovich.

Examiner Vidovich initially directed Applicants to choose a species as directed by Examiner Blount. Applicants again pointed out the relevant MPEP sections at which point Examiner Vidovich remarked that there were no Generic claims as stipulated in the Office action but that claim 1 was a linking claim. Applicants requested a corrected office action to be issued. Examiner Vidovich responded with a direction to Applicants to answer the current office action by choosing one of each species group and that a corrected office action would not be issued.

The following actions by the Applicants are made with the belief that the office action issued on September 6, 2002 is fatally flawed. Applicants actions are made with the reservation that further actions on the part of the USPTO may clarify the position of the USPTO and that the actions detailed below will need to be revised.

The above referenced Office Action alleges that the claims are directed to Ten (10) distinct species of the claimed invention. This Office Action and Interview

Summary requires the applicant to "select one of A and A'" and one of each successive grouping.

In accordance with the Examiner's demand set forth in the Office Action and Interview Summary, the applicant hereby elects species A, B, D", E for prosecution on the merits.

Further in accordance with the Examiner's demand, the applicant lists claims 1-10, 12-19, 22-27 and 30-33 as being readable on elected species A, B, D", E.

The above paragraph constitutes full compliance by the undersigned with the Election/Restriction requirements articulated by the Examiner in the Office Action and Interview Summary. However, nothing in the above paragraphs shall be construed as representing an agreement by the undersigned that the claims are directed to the ten (10) species alleged by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
Faegre & Benson LLP

Date: 10/2/02



Curtis J. Ollila Reg. No. 47,833
Telephone: (303) 546-1300
Facsimile: (303) 449-5426

Correspondence Address:

Customer No: 32827



Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

1. (Amended) A method of manufacturing a Coriolis flowmeter adapted **[adopted]** to extend a received process material flow having an ultra high level of purity free from contamination due to ion transfer from said Coriolis flow meter to said process material; said method comprising the steps of:
 - coupling a flow tube means to a base;
 - affixing a driver to said flow tube means;
 - coupling a pick-off means to said flow tube means; and
 - affixing inlet and outlet ends of said flow tube means to at least one process connection to form an ultra pure flow path for a process material flow through said flow tube means.

RECEIVED

OCT - 9 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700